

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 4-12, 16-24, and 28 are allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-3, 13-15, 25-27, and 29 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 5, and 6 are amended herein. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 13-15, 25-27, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Mishra (US Pub. No.: 2002/0186433).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in pertinent part,

making **soft reservations** for the network resources at the nodes along the route during a first traversal of the route; and

changing the soft reservations to hard reservations to commit the network resources at the nodes along the route during a second traversal of the route.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mishra fails to disclose soft reservations and changing soft reservations to hard reservations to commit network resources.

To be sure, independent claim 1 has been amended to include subject matter similar to subject matter of claim 16 deemed allowable by the Examiner. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Mishra fails to disclose making soft reservation for network resources and then changing the soft reservations to hard reservation to commit network resource.

Consequently, Mishra fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §102 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 recites, in pertinent part,

maintaining a resource reservation table including reservations of switching node apparatus resources for scheduled time slots;

Applicants respectfully submit that Mishra fails to disclose this element of claim 15.

The Examiner cites para. 0038 and 0039 of Mishra and label forwarding table 212 illustrated in FIG. 2 of Mishra as disclosing this element. However, Mishra discloses

[0033] The hybrid network element 200 uses the routing updates and label information to generate a label map, which is a plan outlining wavelengths that are used in the network 100, including the number of channels, channel spacing, channel widths, and channel center wavelengths. The label map is used to generate a switching matrix, which outlines how specific wavelengths are deflected from one path to another (typically from one optical fiber to another).

[0038] In one embodiment, the label-forwarding table 212 receives the routing updates and label information, generates the label map and the switching matrix, and stores the switching matrix.

Accordingly, these portions of Mishra disclose that label-forwarding table 212 is used to generate a label map and switching matrix, which are used to make switching decisions to determine how specific wavelengths are deflected from one path to another. In other words, label-forwarding table 212 provides a road map through network 100. However, label-forwarding table 212 does not disclose a resource reservation table. Label-forwarding table 212 does not maintain reservation information. In contrast, label-forwarding table 212 provides information on how to get from one node to the next, but does not provide information as to whether the resources of any node are reserved.

Applicants are unable to find any portion of Mishra that discloses maintaining a resource reservation table including reservations of switching nodes apparatus resources for scheduled time slots. Consequently, Mishra fails to disclose each and every element of claim 15, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claim 27 includes similar elements as independent claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §102 rejections of claims 15 and 27 be withdrawn.

The dependent claims are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Dec. 21, 2006


Cory G. Claassen

Reg. No. 50,296

Phone: (206) 292-8600